

Response to reviewers

L4 - Please satisfy yourself that 'provision framework' is a thing. Sounds a little odd, but I can't immediately suggest a change.

We have found several examples of this phrase used elsewhere, e.g.

- <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-your-remote-education-provision>
- <https://bidstats.uk/tenders/2020/W18/725876996>
- <https://www.dorsetnexus.org.uk/Article/56474>

L8 - comma before 'with'?

This change has been made.

L47 - Nice that international experience is recognised.

L50 - 'This review' ?

This change has been made.

L52 - This chimes with my experience of supervising high-school students on extended projects.

L55-65 - Good to place PRiSE in the context of other related schemes so that it's benefits can be clearly identified.

L67 - rather than '... typically one' <5 perhaps might be fairer than 1, from my memory of Nuffield 2-3 was quite common although 1 was not unusual. '1 to 3'? It doesn't harm your point.

We have changed this to 1-3 as based on the report of Paull and Xu (2017) for Nuffield Placements, which shows that while the majority of applicants (~55%) and placements (~75%) is just 1 per school, the average number per school is in the range 1-3 (skewed by the long tail).

L135 - Use of supplementary material to avoid lengthy digressions from the stated point of the paper works.

L144-155 - Please consider placing this in a sub-section 2.1.1 highlighting ethics e.g. 'Ethical considerations'. This is something of importance to GC's ethos. If you choose to, renumber following sections i.e. 2.1.2 for Roles of Teachers etc

We have made 'Ethical considerations' a dedicated subsection.

L195 - Motivation of academics is a useful and important aspect to consider. Well put.

L198 - I agree it's definitely 'can' not 'is'. This is not as developed as it could be. Hillier et al (2019) 'Demystifying Academics' in GC (<https://gc.copernicus.org/articles/2/1/2019/>) includes an analysis of how impact is included in academics promotion criteria in the context of how they/we are motivated.

We now reference this paper for interested readers.

L557-559 - Your choice, but a somewhat negative tone. e.g. L559 instead of 'no data' you could just state that 'We have also gathered data on the impact of the PRiSE initiative, which is assessed elsewhere (Archer & Witt, 2020)'

We have made this change.